



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/811,003	03/16/2001	K. Dean Hudson	99-322	7294

7590 09/23/2003

Peter M. Lasorsa  
Caterpillar Inc.  
Intellectual Property Department, AB6490  
100 N.E. Adams Street  
Peoria, IL 61629-6490

EXAMINER

FISCHER, ANDREW J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3627

DATE MAILED: 09/23/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/811,003	HUDSON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Andrew J. Fischer	3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 September 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-9 and 19-21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 10-18 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 3627

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restriction***

1. Applicants' election of Group II (claims 10-18) in Paper No. 4 is acknowledged.

Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP §818.03(a)).

2. Claims 1-9 and 19-21 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in Paper No. 4.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 1<sup>st</sup> Paragraph***

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. It

Art Unit: 3627

is not known how the system performs “automatically editing information” without any input from a person. If a person (i.e. customer) is initiating the editing, it is not automatic.<sup>1</sup>

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph***

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 10-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

a. Claim 10 is unclear. In claim 10 at ~ lines 10 and 11, it is unclear what is “in communication with a corporate charge card provider . . . .” Specifically it is not known if the transaction data is in communication with the mainframe system or in communication with the corporate charge card provider. Appropriate correction is required.

b. In claim 18, it is unclear if “incompleteness, approval, and rejection” must occur in the claims since approval and rejection are opposites.

---

<sup>1</sup> A claim term may not be given a meaning repugnant its usual meaning. *Allen Engineering Corp. v. Bartell Industries Inc.*, 299 F.3d 1336, 1349, 63 USPQ2d 1769, 1776 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (holding that the term “perpendicular” was not allowed to mean “parallel.”); *In re Hill*, 161 F.2d 367, 73 USPQ 482, 484 (CCPA 1947) (A definition may not be given a meaning repugnant its usual meaning.); and MPEP §2173.05(b) subsection titled “A Term May Not Be Given a Meaning Repugnant to its Usual Meaning.”

Art Unit: 3627

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent. . . .

(e) the invention was described in-

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

8. Claims 10-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Buchanan (U.S. 6,009,408 A). Buchanan discloses communicating with a central database server (10) from at least one travel client system (12) in communication with a mainframe gateway server system in communication with the mainframe system; providing traveler charge card transaction data to the mainframe system in communication with the corporate charge card provider (the corporate charge card); providing general ledger processing (inherent since all expenses are reflected in the general ledger); providing payment direction (the system makes payment by EFT); downloading travel charge card data (inherent in the client's system); creating an expense book (creating a list of customer's expenses) without hypothetication of foreign exchange rates (inherent in US dollar transactions); reimbursing a traveler's bank account (the customer gets her money back);

Art Unit: 3627

receiving via a corporate mailhub server (inherent in all corporate email systems) at least one copy of an email directory (inherent).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 18 is alternatively rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buchanan.<sup>2</sup> It is the Examiner principle position that claim 18 is anticipated because e-mailing corporate email directories is inherent. However if not inherent, the Examiner takes Official Notice email systems can mail corporate email directory listings because they are common text files. It therefore would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Buchanan to include mailing corporate email directory listings. Such a modification would have helped keep employees up to date regarding the changes in employee status (hired, fired, etc.).

---

<sup>2</sup> See MPEP §2112 expressly authorizing alternative §102/§103 rejections when the question of inherency is present in the anticipation rejection.

Art Unit: 3627

11. After careful review of the specification and prosecution history, the Examiner is unaware of any desire—either expressly or implicitly—by Applicants to be their own lexicographer and to define a claim term to have a meaning other than its ordinary and accustom meaning. Therefore, the Examiner starts with the heavy presumption that all claim limitations are given their ordinary and accustom meaning. See *Bell Atlantic Network Services Inc. v. Covad Communications Group Inc.*, 262 F.3d 1258, 1268, 59 USPQ2d 1865, 1870 (Fed. Cir. 2001) (“[T]here is a heavy presumption in favor of the ordinary meaning of claim language as understood by one of ordinary skill in the art.”); *CCS Fitness Inc. v. Brunswick Corp.*, 288 F.3d 1359, 1366, 62 USPQ2d 1658, 1662 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (There is a “heavy presumption that a claim term carries its ordinary and customary meaning.”). See also MPEP §2111.01 and *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 321, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989).<sup>3</sup>

In accordance with the ordinary and accustom meaning presumption, during examination the claims are interpreted with their “broadest reasonable interpretation . . . .” *In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027 (Fed. Cir. 1997).<sup>4</sup>

However, if Applicants disagree with the Examiner and have either (a) already used lexicography or (b) wish to use lexicography and therefore (under either (a) or (b)) desire a claim

---

<sup>3</sup> It is the Examiner’s position that “plain meaning” and “ordinary and accustom meaning” are synonymous. See e.g. *Rexnord Corp. v. Laitram Corp.*, 274 F.3d 1336, 1342, 60 USPQ2d 1851, 1854 (Fed. Cir. 2001) (“[A]ll terms in a patent claim are to be given their plain, ordinary and accustom meaning . . . .”).

<sup>4</sup> See also MPEP §2111.

Art Unit: 3627

limitation to have a meaning other than its ordinary and accustom meaning, the Examiner respectfully requests Applicants in their next response to expressly indicate<sup>5</sup> the claim limitation at issue and to show where in the specification or prosecution history the limitation is defined. Such definitions must be clearly stated in the specification or file history. *Bell Atlantic*, 262 F.3d at 1268, 59 USPQ2d at 1870, (“[I]n redefining the meaning of particular claim terms away from the ordinary meaning, the intrinsic evidence must ‘clearly set forth’ or ‘clearly redefine’ a claim term so as to put one reasonably skilled in the art on notice that the patentee intended to so redefine the claim term”).<sup>6</sup> The Examiner cautions that no new matter is allowed.

Failure by Applicants in their next response to properly traverse this issue in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.111(b) or to be non-responsive to this issue entirely will be considered a desire

---

<sup>5</sup> “Absent an *express intent* to impart a novel meaning, terms in a claim are to be given their ordinary and accustomed meaning. [Emphasis added.]” *Wenger Manufacturing Inc. v. Coating Mach. Sys., Inc.*, 239 F.3d 1225, 1232, 57 USPQ2d 1679, 1684 (Fed. Cir. 2001) (citations and quotations omitted). “In the absence of an *express intent* to impart a novel meaning to claim terms, an inventor’s claim terms take on their ordinary meaning. We indulge a heavy presumption that a claim term carries its ordinary and customary meaning. [Emphasis added.]” *Teleflex Inc. v. Ficosa North America Corp.*, 299 F.3d 1313, 1325, 63 USPQ2d 1374, 1380 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (citations and quotations omitted).

<sup>6</sup> See also *Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc.*, 90 F.3d 1576, 1582, 39 USPQ2d 1573, 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996), (“[A] patentee may choose to be his own lexicographer and use terms in a manner other than their ordinary meaning, *as long as* the special definition of the term is *clearly stated* in the patent specification or file history. [Emphasis added.]”); *Multiform Desiccants Inc. v. Medzam Ltd.*, 133 F.3d 1473, 1477, 45 USPQ2d 1429, 1432 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (“Such special meaning, however, must be sufficiently clear in the specification that any departure from common usage would be so understood by a person of experience in the field of the invention.”). See also MPEP §2111.01, subsection titled “Applicant May Be Own Lexicographer” and MPEP §2173.05(a) titled “New Terminology.”

Art Unit: 3627

by Applicants to forgo lexicography in this application and to continue having the claims interpreted with their broadest reasonable interpretation.<sup>7</sup> Additionally, it is the Examiner's position that above requirements are reasonable.<sup>8</sup> Unless expressly noted otherwise by the Examiner, the preceding discussion on claim interpretation principles applies to *all examined claims* currently pending.

12. To the extent that the Examiner's interpretations are in dispute with Applicants' interpretations, the Examiner hereby adopts the following definitions—under the broadest reasonable interpretation standard—in all his claim interpretations.<sup>9</sup> Moreover, while the following list is provided in accordance with *In re Morris*, the definitions are a guide to claim

---

<sup>7</sup> See 37 C.F.R. §1.104(c)(3) which states in part: "the examiner may rely upon admissions by applicant . . . as to *any matter* affecting patentability . . . [Emphasis added.]"

<sup>8</sup> The Examiner's requirements on this matter are reasonable on at least two separate and independent grounds. First, the Examiner's requirements are simply an express request for clarification of how Applicants intend their claims to be interpreted so that lexicography (or even an *attempt* at lexicography) by Applicants is not inadvertently overlooked by the Examiner. Second, the requirements are reasonable in view of the USPTO's goals of compact prosecution, productivity with particular emphasis on reductions in both pendency and cycle time, and other goals as outlined in the USPTO's The 21<sup>st</sup> Century Strategic Plan, February 3, 2003 available at [www.uspto.gov/web/offices/com/strat21/index.htm](http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/com/strat21/index.htm) (last accessed September 15, 2003).

<sup>9</sup> While most definitions are cited because these terms are found in the claims, some additional definitions are provided to help interpret words, phrases, or concepts found in the definitions themselves.

Art Unit: 3627

terminology since claim terms must be interpreted in context of the surrounding claim language.<sup>10</sup>

Finally, the list is not intended to be exhaustive in any way.

- a. ***Server***: “2. On the Internet or other network, a computer or program that responds to commands from a client.” Computer Dictionary, 3rd Edition, Microsoft Press, Redmond, WA, 1997.<sup>11</sup> ***Client***: “3. On a local area network or Internet, a computer that accesses shared network resources provided by another computer (called a *server*).” *Id.* ***Computer***: “Any machine that does three things: accepts structured input, processes it according to prescribed rules, and produces the results as output.” *Id.* Clear
- b. ***Database*** “A file composed of records, each containing fields together with a set of operations for searching, sorting, recombining and other functions.” *Id.*
- c. ***Gateway*** “A device that connects networks using different communication protocols so that information can be passed from one the other. A gateway both transfers

---

<sup>10</sup> See e.g. *Brookhill-Wilk I LLC v. Intuitive Surgical Inc.*, 334 F.3d 1294, 1300, 67 USPQ2d 1132, 1137 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (abstract dictionary definitions are not alone determinative; “resort must always be made to the surrounding text of the claims in question”).

<sup>11</sup> Based upon Applicants’ disclosure, the art now of record, and the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in this art, the Examiner’s finds that the *Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary* is an appropriate technical dictionary known to be used by one of ordinary skill in this art. See e.g. *Altiris Inc. v. Symantec Corp.*, 318 F.3d 1363, 1373, 65 USPQ2d 1865, 1872 (Fed. Cir. 2003) where the Federal Circuit used *Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary* (3d ed.) as “a technical dictionary” used to define the term “flag.” See also *In re Barr*, 444 F.2d 588, 170 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1971)(noting that its appropriate to use technical dictionaries in order to ascertain the meaning of a term of art) and MPEP §2173.05(a) titled “New Terminology”.

Art Unit: 3627

information and converts it to a form compatible with the protocols used by the receiving network. *Compare* bridge.” *Id.*

d. **Data** “Plural of the Latin *datum*, meaning an item of information. In practice, data is often used for the singular as well as plural the form of the noun.” *Id.*

e. “**General Ledger** formal ledger containing all the financial statement accounts of a business. It contains offsetting debt and credit accounts. Certain accounts in the general ledger, termed *control accounts*, summarize the details booked on separate subsidiary ledgers.”

Dictionary of Business Terms, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, Barron’s Educational Series, Inc., 2000. “**Control Account** account that shows totals of amounts entered in a SUBSIDIARY LEDGER, as an accounts payable *control account* would show the total that is detailed in the accounts payable subsidiary ledger.” *Id.*

### ***Conclusion***

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure includes the following: Anderson et. al. (U.S. 6,360,211 B1); Dent et. al. (U.S. 6,128,603 A); Neely (U.S. 6,044,362 A); Barrett et. al. (U.S. 6,029,144 A); Tran (U.S. 5,991,742 A); Taylor et. al. (U.S. 5,899,981 A); O’Brien (U.S. 5,832,453 A); Miguez et. al. (U.S. 5,787,373 A); Pollin (U.S. 5,727,249 A); Shoolery et. al. (U.S. 5,570,283 A); Dettelbach et. al. (U.S. 5,253,166 A); Thompson et. al. (U.S. 5,121,945 A); Webber et. al. (U.S. 5,021,953 A); Webb (U.S. 4,852,000 A); Concur Technologies Press Release: *Concur Technologies Introduces*

Art Unit: 3627

*Enhanced Web-based Travel Expense Management Solutions; Concur Technologies Press Release: American Express and Concur Technologies Unveil Special XMS Features for American Express Clients; Concur Technologies Press Release: Portable Software First to Market with Intranet Travel Expense Automation Solution; Concur Technologies Press Release: American Express Corporate Services Announces Alliance with Portable Software Corporation to Offer Travel Expense Management Solution; Concur Technologies Press Release: American Express Offers Portable Software 's XMS as it Recommended Travel Expense Management Solution; Concur Technologies Press Release: Internet Travel Network and Portable Software Enter Alliance; American Express Press Release: American Express Corporate Services Announces Alliance with Portable Software Corporation to Offer Travel Expense Management Solutions; American Express Annual Report 1998; Nelson, Stephen L., *Quicken 98 for Dummies*, Chapters 6, 7, 11, and 17; and Expense Plus for Palm OS, User Handbook.*

14. The following two (2) citations to the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure ("MPEP") apply to this Office Action: MPEP citations to Chapters 200, 700, 1800, and 2100 are from the MPEP 8<sup>th</sup> Edition, Rev 1, February 2003. All remaining MPEP citations are from MPEP 8<sup>th</sup> Edition, August 2001.

15. In accordance with In re Lee, 277 F.3d 1338, 1344, 61 USPQ2d 1430, 1434-35 (Fed. Cir. 2002), the Examiner finds that the references How Computers Work Millennium Ed. by Ron White; How Networks Work, Millennium Ed. by Frank J. Derfler et. al.; and How the Internet Works, Millennium Ed. by Preston Gralla are additional evidence of what is basic knowledge or

Art Unit: 3627

common sense to one of ordinary skill in this art. Each reference is cited in its entirety. Moreover, because these three references are directed towards beginners (see e.g. "User Level: Beginning . . ."), because of the references' basic content (which is self-evident upon review of the references), and after further review of both the intrinsic evidence of record and the entire art now of record in conjunction with the factors as discussed in MPEP §2141.03, the Examiner finds that these three references are primarily directed towards those of low skill in this art. Because these three references are directed towards those of low skill in this art, the Examiner finds that one of ordinary skill in this art must—at the very least—be aware of the knowledge and information contained within these three references.

16. Suggestions or examples of claim language provided by the Examiner in this Office Action are just that—suggestions or examples—and do not constitute a formal requirement mandated by the Examiner. Unless stated otherwise by an express indication that the claim is "allowed," exemplary claim language provided by the Examiner to overcome a particular rejection or to change claim interpretation has *not been addressed* with respect to other aspects of patentability (e.g. §101 patentable subject matter, §112 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph written description and enablement, §112 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph indefiniteness, and §102 and §103 prior art). Therefore, any claim amendment that incorporates an Examiner suggestion or example or simply changes claim interpretation will still require further consideration and/or search and a patentability determination as noted above.

17. All factual findings and conclusions of law in this Office Action are based the entire record. Although the Examiner may have singled out various items of evidence (e.g. Buchanan)

Art Unit: 3627

and expressly noted its content, the other documents now of record were also considered and applied when making the Examiner's factual findings and conclusions of law (see e.g. the prior art rejections above). Moreover, because many of the cannons of claim construction are generally viewed from a person of ordinary skill in the art,<sup>12</sup> the other documents of record not specifically mentioned in the prior art rejection(s) above were nevertheless used in the Examiner's deliberative process to access, *inter alia*, the definiteness of the claims, the level of skill in the art, and ultimately the patentability of the claimed invention.

18. In accordance with the USPTO's goals of customer service, compact prosecution, and reduction of cycle time, the Examiner has made every effort to clarify his position regarding claim interpretation and any rejections or objections in this application. Furthermore, the Examiner has provided Applicants with notice—for due process purposes—of his position regarding his factual determinations and legal conclusions. If Applicants disagree with *any* factual determination or legal conclusion made by the Examiner in this Office Action whether expressly stated or implied,<sup>13</sup> the Examiner respectfully reminds Applicants to properly traverse the Examiner's position(s) in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.111(b) *in their next response*. By addressing these issues now, matters where the Examiner and Applicants agree can be eliminated allowing the Examiner and

---

<sup>12</sup> See e.g. *Orthokinetics, Inc. v. Safety Travel Chairs, Inc.*, 806 F.2d 1565, 1576, 1 USPQ2d 1081, 1088 (Fed. Cir. 1986)(noting that the definiteness inquiry focuses on whether those skilled in the art would understand the scope of the claim).

<sup>13</sup> E.g., if the Examiner rejected a claim under §103 with two references, although not directly stated, it is the Examiner's implied position that the references are analogous art.

Art Unit: 3627

Applicants to focus on areas of disagreement (if any) with the goal towards allowance in the shortest possible time. If Applicants have any questions regarding the Examiner's positions or have other questions regarding this communication or even previous communications, Applicants are strongly encouraged to contact Examiner Andrew J. Fischer whose telephone number is (703) 305-0292.

*AJ Fischer* 9/16/03

Andrew J. Fischer  
Patent Examiner

AJF  
September 16, 2003